



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,478	06/24/2003	Adele L. Boskey	05983/100J990-US1	3518
7278	7590	03/08/2007		
DARBY & DARBY P.C. P. O. BOX 5257 NEW YORK, NY 10150-5257			EXAMINER KWON, BRIAN YONG S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1614	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/08/2007	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

TW

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/603,478

Applicant(s)

BOSKEY ET AL.

Examiner

Brian S. Kwon

Art Unit

1614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 and 29-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24 and 29-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of Application***

1. By Amendment filed 12/11/06, claims 24 and 32 have been amended and claims 25-28 have been cancelled.
2. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 14, 24 and 29-34 are currently pending for prosecution on the merits.

### ***Summary of Action***

3. The rejection of claims 24 and 29-34 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is not maintained in light of the amendment.
4. The rejection of claims 24, 25, 29, 30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Jefferies (US 6311690) is not maintained in light of the amendment.
5. The rejection of claims 1-5 and 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by A. Boskey (The Journal of Physical Chemistry, 1989, 93, 1628-1633) is maintained for the reasons of record.
6. The rejection of claims 27-28 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jefferies (US 6311690) in view of Hollinger (US 4578384) is not maintained in light of the amendment.
7. The rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jefferies (US 6311690) in view of Applicant's admitted prior art of the record (page 3, lines 10-23) is not maintained in light of the amendment.
8. The rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jefferies (US 6311690) is not maintained in light of the amendment.

Art Unit: 1614

9. Applicant's amendment changing the scope of the invention by requiring "selected from the group consisting of bone, calcifying cartilage, dentine and cementum, wherein the complexed-acidic-phospholipid-collagen composition comprises calcium, phospholipids, inorganic phosphate and collagen" in claim 24 necessitates a new ground of rejection in this Office Action.

*Response to Arguments*

10. Applicant's arguments filed 12/11/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument in the response takes the position that gelatin in the Boskey's dynamic hydroxyapatite growth formation composition is different from the instantly required collagen due to its different structure and function.

This argument is found unpersuasive. Since the broadest reasonable interpretation of collagen still encompasses gelatin (even if it is denatured or processed collagen), the examiner maintains that Boskey anticipates the instant invention.

In response to the applicant's remark to the 1977 Boskey paper, the specific molar ratio of calcium phospholipids and inorganic phosphate in the complex deems to be inherent to the Boskey (The Journal of Physical Chemistry, 1989, 93, 1628-1633). Since the naturally prepared (extracted) Ca-phospholipid-PO<sub>4</sub> complexes must have molar ratio range of the claims 2-4 as evidenced by the 1977 Boskey (see also Boskey et al., Calcif. Tiss. Res., 1982, 34:S1-S7; Boskey et al., Calcif. Tiss. Res. 19, 273-283, 1976 and Boskey et al., Metab. Dis. Relat. Res.

Art Unit: 1614

1978, 1. 137-142), in absence of evidence to the contrary, the examiner determines that the later published 1989 Boskey anticipates the claimed invention (claims 1-5 and 8-11 drawn to a composition).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. Claims 24 and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The preamble of the claim 24 refers to the instant invention as “a method of inducing the growth of bone”. The term “bone” is not interchangeable with term “tissue” as suggested in line 3 of the claim 24. Since the “bone, calcifying cartilage, dentin and cementum” is desired site of bone growth by the administration of said composite, not tissue growth, such inconsistency leaves the reader in doubt as to the meaning of the invention to which they refer, thereby rendering the definition of the subject-matter of said claims unclear.

Applicant is suggested to amend claim 24 to “...at a site in need of desired bone growth selected from the group consisting of bone, calcifying...” to obviate the instant rejection under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1614

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

12. Claims 1-5 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by A.

Boskey (The Journal of Physical Chemistry, 1989, 93, 1628-1633).

The claims read on a composition comprising an acidic-phospholipid complex and collagen, wherein the complex comprises (i) calcium, namely calcium chloride, (ii) phospholipids, namely phosphatidylserine and (iii) inorganic phosphate, namely ammonium acid phosphate. Further limitations include "in molar ratio of 45-55 parts calcium:35-45 parts phospholipids:5-15 parts inorganic phosphate" (claim 2); "in a molar ratio range of 47-53 parts calcium:38-42 parts phospholipids: 8-12 parts inorganic phosphate" (claim 3); "in a molar ratio of 50 parts calcium: 40 parts phospholipids: 10 parts inorganic phosphate" (claim 5).

Boskey teaches a dynamic collagen gel system comprising synthetic complexed acidic phospholipids (calcium-phospholipid-phosphate complex comprises  $\text{CaCl}_2$ ,  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$  and phospholipids: phosphatidyl serine, phosphatidyl inositol and phosphatidic acid, where calcium, phospholipid and inorganic phosphate is in a molar ratio range of 50 mol% (Ca): 40 mol% (phospholipids): 10 mol%(inorganic  $\text{PO}_4$ ), see Boskey et al. (Calcif. Tiss. Res., 23, 251-258, 1977, particularly "Material and Methods" and "Results"). See abstract; page 1629, column 2, the last paragraph; and Tables II-III.

Although Boskey does not specifically mention the presence of calcium chloride ( $\text{CaCl}_2$ ), ammonium acid phosphate  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$  and phosphatidylserine, in a molar ratio range of 50 mol% (Ca): 40 mol% (phospholipids): 10 mol%(inorganic  $\text{PO}_4$ ), in said synthetic complexed acidic phospholipids, such ingredients in the claimed ratio must be inherently present in the

Art Unit: 1614

referenced synthetic complexed acidic phospholipids. Therefore, the reference anticipates the claimed invention.

With respect to the intended use of said composition "for osteoinduction", such statement is not limited to the interpretation of composition claim. Thus, the reference anticipates the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1614

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

13. Claims 24 and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeffries (US 6311690) in view of Hollinger (US 4578384).

The claims read a method of inducing the growth of bone in mammal comprising administering complexed-acidic-phospholipid-collagen composite at a site in need of desired tissue growth. Further limitations include "bone growth" (claim 25); "the composite is in paste form, sponge form, molded form or preadsorbed onto an implant material" (claim 29); "the composite is encapsulated by an organic polymer" (claim 30); "further comprising one or more materials selected from the group consisting of autologous osteoblasts, odontoblasts, antibiotics, growth factors, cytokines and nanomaterials" (claim 32).

Jeffries teaches a collagen-calcium phosphate conjugate or a reconstituted collagen and acidic-phospholipids conjugate that is useful in inducing bone growth (Examples Twelve, Fifteen-Eighteen and Twenty-Eight), wherein said composition is administered in the form of implant material (column 1, lines 18-25; column 5, line 9); prepared in biopolymer organic matrix (column 5, lines 44-47 and column 7, lines 49-51); further comprises additional osteogenic factors, mitogens, drugs or antibiotics (abstract and claim 6). Jeffries also teaches the addition of biogenic component (i.e., acidic phospholipids or phospholipids) to increase tensile strength of said collagen-calcium phosphate particle conjugate (column 6, lines 13-43, particularly lines 35-36).

Hollinger is being supplied as a supplemental reference to demonstrate the use of biocompatible copolymer such as polyglycolic acid and polylactic acid in combination with



Art Unit: 1614

acidic phospholipids complex for improving and promoting the healing of osseous tissue including bone, cementum and dentin (abstract; column 14, lines 28-32).

The teaching of Jeffries differs from the claimed invention in (i) the use of polyglycolic acid and the specific dosage amounts, namely “between about 5 mg and about 5g”.

To incorporate such teaching into the teaching Jefferies, would have been obvious in view of Hollinger who teaches the use of biocompatible copolymer as secondary agent in preparing acidic phospholipids complex and the utility of acidic phospholipids complex composition in healing of osseous tissue including bone, cementum and dentin.

Although the instant claims use the different names for the said ingredients than those taught in the cited references, these references are particularly pertinent and relevant because all the claimed species and their roles are well taught in the cited reference. Thus, one would have been motivated to combine these references and make the modification because they are drawn to same technical fields (constituted with same ingredients and share common utilities), and pertinent to the problem which applicant concerns about. MPEP 2141.01(a).

With respect to the specific dosage amounts, namely “between about 5 mg and about 5g”.

However, those of ordinary skill in the art would have been readily optimized effective dosages as determined by good medical practice and the clinical condition of the individual patient. Regardless of the manner of administration, the specific dose may be calculated according to body weight, body surface area or organ size. Further refinement of the calculations necessary to determine the appropriate dosage for treatment involving each of the above mentioned formulations is routinely made by those of ordinary skill in the art and is within the

Art Unit: 1614

ability of tasks routinely performed by them without undue experimentation, especially in light of the dosage information and assays disclosed herein (Examples).

### ***Relevant Art of Record***

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's invention. Please reference to Boskey et al. (Calcif. Tiss. Res., 23, 251-258, 1977 and Calcif. Tiss. Res., 1982, 34:S1-S7. Both reference discloses that synthetic calcium-phospholipid-phosphate complex comprises  $\text{CaCl}_2$ ,  $(\text{NH}_4)_2\text{HPO}_4$  and phospholipids: phosphatidyl serine, phosphatidyl inositol and phosphatidic acid. Particularly, Boskey et al. (Calcif. Tiss. Res., 23, 251-258, 1977) discloses that calcium, phospholipid and inorganic phosphate is in a molar ratio range of 50 mol% (Ca): 40 mol% (phospholipids): 10 mol% (inorganic  $\text{PO}_4$ ).

### **Conclusion**

15. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 1614

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

16. No Claim is allowed.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Kwon whose telephone number is (571) 272-0581. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ardin Marschel, can be reached on (571) 272-0718. The fax number for this Group is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications may be obtained from Private PAIR only. For more information about PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov> Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Brian Kwon  
Primary Patent Examiner  
AU 1614

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian Kwon', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.